



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,707	09/26/2003	Timothy J. Van Hook	00100.01.0022	1126
29153 7590 04/17/2008 ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC. C/O VEDDER PRICE P.C. 222 N.LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60601			EXAMINER MOTSINGER, SEAN T	
			ART UNIT 2624	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/17/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/672,707

Applicant(s)

VAN HOOK ET AL.

Examiner

Sean Motsinger

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-61 and 63-93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-33,36-54 and 69-88 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 89-93 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,12,13,34,35,55-58,60,67 and 68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4,8-11,59 and 63-66 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Applicants Arguments

Applicants Arguments/Amendments filed on 11/16/2007 have been entered and made of record.

With regard to applicants arguments regarding the rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112 applicant's amendments have overcome the rejections and they are no longer applicable.

With regard to applicants arguments with regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) applicants arguments have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that tiles are either wholly compressed or not compressed at all because unreduced fragments are expanded and stored uncompressed. While it is some embodiments true that unreduced tiles are stored in an uncompressed form. Some compressed tiles are further compressed (compacted). Therefore partial compression is reflected in reduction alone while full compression is reduction and compaction (column 8 lines 1-10). While the above interpretation is the one the examiner is relying on in the rejection examiner also notes the reference does state "as an option a reduction can be performed on a subset of a tile" Column 7 lines 15-25; although this section is presently not relevant as this interpretation of partial compression is not presently being used. Examiner notes that the claim is sufficiently broad to interoperate "partial compression" in any number of ways. In fact it is not clear that there even needs to exist a "full compression" as there is not full compression claimed in claim 1.

With regard to claim 6 applicant states that a one word per pixel limitation does not exist in the cited portion of the reference. The examiner further directs applicant to column 9 lines 45-60 and column 8 lines 1-10. Note a tile can be stored as reduced and compacted or reduced and uncompact. Note the bit amounts in column 9 provide such a relationship.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 12-13, 34-35, 55-58, 60-62, and 67-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Molnar et al US 6,825,847.

Re claim 1 Molnar further discloses A method of data compression comprising: grouping a plurality of pixel data into a plurality of tiles (column 2 lines 10-15); evaluating said tiles for compression suitability (capable of being compressed column 2 lines 1-5), wherein said compression recognizes duplicate data (identical data column 2 lines 25-30) and reduces (reduction column 2 lines 25-

30) amount of duplicate data stored within said tiles; compressing said tiles if said tiles are deemed suitable for said compression (column 2 lines 5-10) wherein said step of evaluating further comprises: determining whether a tile is suitable for partial compression (reduction alone note a reduced uncompacted tile can be stored column 7 lines 45-55 column 8 lines 5-10); designating said tile for partial compression if it is deemed to be suitable (reduction column 7 lines 45-55).

Re claim 2 Molnar further discloses wherein said pixel data is color information (column 2 lines 25-30)

Re claim 3 Molnar further discloses wherein said step of evaluating further comprises: determining whether a tile is suitable for full compression (reduction and compaction column 7 lines 60-67) designating said tile for full compression if it is deemed to be suitable (reduced and compacted column 80 lines 1-10)

Re claim 5 Molnar further discloses wherein said step of compressing further comprises: storing a single color entry for each pixel in said tile (column 10 lines 2-35 note a single color value is stored for each pixel also see column 7 lines 20-30 note a reduced tile is one where all pixels have one color).

Re claim 6 Molnar further discloses wherein said full compression compresses said pixel data into one word per pixel (see column 9 lines 45-60 note 128 bits per 8 pixels is 1, 16 bit word per pixel.)

Re claim 12 Molnar further discloses wherein said partial compression compresses said pixel data into two words per pixel (column 9 lines 20-35, 256 bits per 8 pixels is 2, 16 bit word per pixel).

Re claim 13 Molnar further discloses wherein said tiles are 2.times.2 in size (see figure 3 note one of the tiles to chose from is 2x2 also see figure 15 note both size tiles can be used for the same invention).

Re claims 56-58, 60-61, and 67-68 These claims are substantially the same as claims 1-3, 5-6, and 12-13 respectively only they are directed to a computer readable medium storing a program for performing these methods, Molnar also discloses performing his method on a computer with software see figure 1 and column 4 lines 35-45.

Re claims 34, 35 and 55, these claims are similar to claims 1, 2 and 13 respectively only they claim a graphics processing apparatus for performing these methods. Molnar also discloses with a graphics processing apparatus see figure 1 and column 4 lines 35-45.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 89-93 are allowable because they are prior allowable subject matter written in independent form. Claims 4, 8-11, 59, and 63-66 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth- in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 4 and 59 contain allowable subject matter because the prior art of record does not include "wherein said step of determining further comprises: determining whether said tile is wholly covered by a triangle primitive". Claims 8 and 63 contain allowable subject matter because the prior art of record does not "determine whether said tile is covered by two triangle primitives". Claim 9-11 and 64-66 contain allowable subject matter because the prior art of record does not "assign an order to triangle primitives covering said tile."

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean Motsinger whose telephone number is 571-270-1237. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jingge Wu can be reached on (571)272-7429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Motsinger
2/18/2008

JINGGE WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



Application/Control Number:
10/672,707
Art Unit: 2624

Page 8